



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
ENGINEERING FIELD ACTIVITY, WEST
NAVAL FACILITIES ENGINEERING COMMAND
800 COMMODORE DRIVE
SAN BRUNO, CALIFORNIA 94068-5006

IN REPLY REFER TO:

5090
Ser 10121/1168
9 November 1998

From: Commanding Officer, Engineering Field Activity West, Naval Facilities Engineering Command
To: Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Members Distribution List, Weapons Support Facility Seal Beach, Detachment Concord
Subj: RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB): MINUTES OF 17 SEPTEMBER 1998 RAB MEETING

Encls: (1) Weapons Support Facility Seal Beach, Detachment Concord, Restoration Advisory Board Draft Meeting Minutes -- Thursday, 17 September 1998

1. Draft minutes of the 17 September 1998 Weapons Support Facility Seal Beach, Detachment Concord, Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) meeting are forwarded as enclosure (1). Any corrections or clarifications to these minutes can be provided at the next RAB meeting, at which time the minutes will be finalized.
2. There will be no RAB meeting in November, but the Clyde community center will be be available for use by RAB community members to review and discuss the draft landfill proposed plan/record of decision (PP/ROD). This document was submitted for review on 25 September 1998, with comments due on 25 November.
3. The next scheduled RAB meeting is planned for 21 January 1999.
4. Please note there was a name change again for the weapons station, effective 1 October 1998, from Weapons Support Facility Seal Beach, Detachment Concord to Naval Weapons Station, Seal Beach Detachment Concord. This new designation for the weapons station will appear in all future correspondence and documents.
5. If you have any questions regarding this correspondence, please contact Mr Steve Gallo, the RAB Community Co-chair, at (925) 427-3450; or Mr. Stan Heller, the Navy Co-chair, at (925) 246-5672.


WING WONG
By direction

Distribution:
Ms. Elizabeth Robinson Anello
Mr. Steven Bachofer
Mr. Scott Etzel
Mr. Steve Gallo

Ms. Dee Kilcoyne
Mr. David Kory
Ms. Sylvia Kotecki
Ms. Nicole Moutoux
Mr. Marcus O'Connell
Mr. James Pinasco
Mr. Richard Purdue
Ms. Catie Roy
Mr. Roy Santana
Mr. Thomas Shirley
Mr. Larry Steinwandt
Mr. Gene Sylls

Blind copy to (w/encl):
TtEMI (Attn: John Bosche)
1012, 10121, 10122
Information repository: (3 copies)
Chron

**WEAPONS SUPPORT FACILITY SEAL BEACH, DETACHMENT CONCORD
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD**

DRAFT MEETING MINUTES

**Clyde Community Center
Clyde, California**

Thursday, 17 September 1998

I. Welcome and Introductions, Community Co-Chair's Report, and Review/Approval of Meeting Minutes

The Weapons Support Facility Seal Beach, Detachment Concord Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) met on Thursday, 17 September at the Clyde Community Center, Clyde, California. Steve Gallo, Community Co-Chair, welcomed attendees and emphasized that one of the duties of RAB members is to share information about Concord's environmental restoration with the public and return the concerns of the community back to the Navy. He announced that he intended to continue recruiting new members and to develop an outreach program. Ralph Lee has compiled a list of people who have attended RAB meetings over the past year for Mr. Gallo and Mr. Gardner to use for community outreach. Stan Heller, Navy Co-Chair, stated that along with assessing the level of interest in filling the co-chair position, people on the list could also be asked whether they are interested in receiving fact sheets. He suggested that fact sheets could be mailed to names on an expanded mailing list to augment quarterly RAB meetings.

Mr. Gallo announced that free public service announcements on TCI Cable TV must be sponsored by a County agency. He will look into associating the RAB with a branch of the County Health Department to meet TCI's requirements.

Mr. Heller noted that he had invited the Captain and Executive Officer to the RAB tonight for a briefing on the No Further Action Record of Decision and Proposed Plan so they can assess their level of involvement in these activities. He will forward meeting minutes to them.

Mr. Gallo called for discussion and comments on the 16 July 1998 meeting minutes. He asked John Bosche, Tetra Tech Environmental Management, Inc., (TtEMI) whether the Draft No Further Action Record of Decision for Site 13, 17, 22, and 27 had been submitted. Mr. Gallo noted that he had not received his copy. Anju Wicke, TtEMI, announced that copies were sent out on 24 August. Mr. Bosche provided his copy to Mr. Gallo at the meeting.

Mr. Gallo asked Mr. Heller whether underground storage tanks (USTs) IA-17 A-D near Building IA-16 had been removed. Mr. Heller explained that the deadline for taking single-walled USTs out-of-service is the end of 1998; though the tanks have not been excavated, he sees no problem in meeting that deadline. He did note, however, that construction of a new service station in the

area has caused delays. Since the Navy has an appointment with the County regulator in November, plans are to have USTs removed by then.

Meeting minutes from 16 July 1998 were approved as written at the end of the meeting.

II. Annual Community Co-Chair Election: 1) Nomination of Candidates, 2) Presentations by Nominees, and 3) Final Vote

Mr. Heller asked Mr. Gallo whether he was interested in continuing as Co-Chair, since he was the only community member in attendance early in the meeting. Mr. Gallo agreed to continue as Co-Chair, and noted that his goals are to:

- identify methods for increasing attendance at meetings
- determine appropriate frequency of RAB meetings
- determine appropriate content and number of fact sheets

Mr. Heller announced that the Navy has just issued a new draft version of Navy guidelines for review in OPNAVINST 5090.1B, Chapter 15, *The Installation Restoration Program*. In it, two year terms for RAB members have been deleted, and RABs appear to have been given more flexibility.

Two students from Northgate High School joined the meeting and related that they chose to attend the RAB meeting from a list of community activities posted on a web site by a teacher. After they attend an activity, they are to report back to their teacher. Mr. Gallo informed the students that the RAB advises the Navy on environmental restoration activities at Weapons Support Facility Seal Beach, Detachment Concord. Mr. Lee added that environmental cleanup is carried out according to guidelines found within the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA), otherwise known as Superfund.

III. Overview of Proposed Plan Process

Ms. Wicke explained that CERCLA requires a phased approach to environmental cleanup. Weapons Support Facility Seal Beach, Detachment Concord is divided into three main areas: the Tidal Area, the Litigation Area, and the Inland Area. Each area is processed through the appropriate phases. Cleanup of the Inland Area is proceeding through a No Action Record of Decision.

Initially, a Site Investigation was conducted for 11 Inland Area Sites based on a preliminary assessment. Five sites were recommended for a Remedial Investigation (RI) study which was conducted in 1995. One of the five sites was removed from the IR program, and the remaining four sites were recommended for no further based on the risk assessments and data analysis, the

Navy determined that the sites pose no significant risk to human health or the environment. Therefore, the Navy is recommending no further action at each of these sites. The rationale for this decision is documented in the **No Action Record of Decision (ROD)** which is summarized in a **No Action Proposed Plan**. The Navy will host a **public meeting** to explain the ROD, to answer questions, and to solicit public opinion. Comments may also be submitted to the Navy during a **30-day open comment period**. The final ROD will contain a section called *Explanation of Significant Changes* to document how the final ROD was modified by public comment. A *Responsiveness Summary* is included to document the Navy's response to all comments received during the comment period.

The Navy plans on sending out the No Action Proposed Plan for the Inland Area Sites at the end of March, and a public notice will be posted in the newspapers to invite public comment between 19 March and 19 April. The Public meeting is tentatively scheduled for 05 April.

Since the Navy is proposing to take remedial action in the Tidal Area, a **Feasibility Study (FS)** was developed after the RI in order to compare cleanup alternatives and costs. The FS enables the Navy to choose appropriate cleanup methods and/or technologies. Ms. Wicke noted that the Navy has chosen to construct a cap on the Tidal Area Landfill Site, and the supporting logic and decision will be presented in the **Tidal Area Landfill Site 1 Proposed Plan and ROD**.

Mr. Lee announced that all documents pertaining to the ROD, as well as the ROD itself, may be found in the Main County Library in Pleasant Hill, California.

IV. Presentation on the Draft Proposed Plan and Record of Decision for the Inland Area Sites

John Bosche, TtEMI, shared specific details of the Inland Area Proposed Plan and ROD. The Inland Area, he continued, includes four sites - 13, 17, 22, and 27. Site 13 was basically a grass-covered hillside once used for practice burns between the 1940's and 1974. Ordnance such as flares, chemicals, and powders were burned, and the area was analyzed for residues that potentially could pose a threat to human health and the environment. Samples were analyzed for petroleum hydrocarbons, volatile organics (VOCs), semivolatile organics (SVOCs), and metals. The distribution of the metal results did not indicate a discrete source, and there was no indication of contamination migrating off-site. Results for the Burn Area Site after the RI sampling consisted of hydrocarbons, VOC's, SVOC's and metals. A small area where burnt napalm residue was found was excavated in October 1997, and confirmation samples were analyzed for petroleum hydrocarbons and benzene. The confirmation samples only detected levels of no more than 100mg/kg of petroleum hydrocarbons. On the basis of the human and ecological risk assessments that are summarized in the ROD, the Navy has concluded that the site poses no significant risk and requires no remediation.

Site 17, Mr. Bosche continued, was a Fork Lift and Battery Maintenance Facility. Steam cleaning

operations at the site required a discharge line that emptied into Seal Creek. USTs and septic tanks were located at Site 17, and the Navy investigated for a possible acid disposal sump. During the RI, the area was extensively sampled; the Navy found neither physical evidence nor contamination that would suggest sump disposal activities. The Navy concluded that either the sump didn't exist or it left no contamination. The Navy did detect some SVOCs in concentrations lower than preliminary remediation goals (PRGs), developed by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency to protect human health. Benzo(a)pyrene was detected at concentrations comparable to that found in urban and rural soil. Bis-2(ethylhexyl)phthalate was detected in groundwater at concentrations above laboratory contamination. Two additional rounds of groundwater sampling were conducted in 1998 and no detections were present. Thus, the bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate initially detected was most likely to be a laboratory contaminant. The Navy found no apparent source of contamination, and results fell within safe limits for humans and the environment. Therefore, it was determined that the area poses no risk to human or ecological health and requires no further action.

Site 22 was investigated for paint thinners, cleaning solvents, volatile organics and chemicals that were once used for Missile Wing and Fin Repairs in the area. The Navy investigated for another discharge pit and found no physical or chemical evidence of the alleged pit. A UST was discovered, along with arsenic in surface soil. Trichloroethene (TCE) was only detected once at 27ppb, in a grab groundwater sample. Four quarters of groundwater monitoring were conducted to confirm the presence and extent of TCE. TCE was detected below screening levels (MCL's) and inconsistently. Therefore the Site has recommended for no further action.

Site 27, once a Materials Testing Lab, was analyzed for chlorofluorocarbons, mineral spirits, oil, acids, bases, pesticides, and polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs). The Navy did find a diesel UST. Chlordane was detected around the perimeter of a building which is a typical termite control pattern. Due to Chlordane's immobility and persistence, it still is found in soil samples. Mr. Bosche explained that CERCLA excludes Chlordane when it is used for its intended purpose, as it was in this case. PCBs were detected at 1 mg/kg. VOCs and SVOCs were below PRGs. Based on data analysis and the risk assessment, the Navy concluded that Site 27 presents no risk to human health. Since the area is devoid of ecological habitat, there is no ecological risk. The area is proposed for no further action.

The No Action ROD contains the comprehensive analysis and logic for taking the no action approach. In contrast, the Navy is developing the Tidal Area ROD which summarizes remedial action alternatives for the landfill site.

Mr. Gallo noticed that the ROD appeared to be nearly complete and asked why there is a delay in finalization of the document. Ms. Wicke responded that review periods are required by CERCLA before issuing the final document. Nicole Moutoux, U.S.EPA, added that the document is submitted for draft and draft final comment to address all concerns before finalization.

V. Date and Agenda for Next Meeting

The next meeting will be held at the Clyde Community Center on 19 November 1998.

Possible future agenda items include:

- Tidal Area Proposed Plan and ROD

VI. Open Comment Period

Mr. Heller mentioned that the Navy had found a six-inch layer of material that appears to be part of a roadbed made out of residue from a paint process or slag while excavating in an area of concern near RASS-4. The material is currently covered by six inches of soil. Mr. Heller stated that he contacted Richard Pieper, who noted that it was common to use the material as fill. The Navy will be gathering more information on the area.

Nicole Moutoux, U.S.EPA, recommended creating a fact sheet that summarizes remediation activities on Concord. Next year, she reflected, areas will be specifically addressed as documents are submitted for review. She also suggested placing RAB meeting announcements in the fact sheet. Steve Bachofer suggested publishing the fact sheet on a web page. Clint Fisher, Engineering Field Activity West (EFA West), responded that the San Bruno facility is currently creating a web page that may become available for such purposes.

A copy of these meeting minutes will be made available for public review at the Information Repository located at the Main Branch of the Contra Costa County Library in Pleasant Hill, CA.

ATTACHMENT A

**Attendance List
NWS Concord
Restoration Advisory Board Meeting
Thursday, September 17, 1998**

**Naval Weapons Station, Concord
Restoration Advisory Board Meeting Attendance**

Date: 9/17/98

RAB MEMBER	Signature	Phone Number
Steven Bachofer	<i>Steven Bachofer</i>	947-1453
Scott Etzel		
Steve Gallo	<i>Steve Gallo</i>	(925) 370-7969
Edward Gardner		
Dee Kilcoyne		
Sylvia Kotecki		
Richard Purdue		
Thomas Shirley		
Larry Steinwandt		
Gene Sylls		
Steve Volk		
NAVY REPRESENTATIVES		
Clint Fisher (EFA West)	<i>Clint Fisher</i>	650-244-2769
Mary Gleason (Tetra Tech EM Inc.)		
Stan Heller (NWS Concord)	<i>Stan Heller</i>	925-246-5672
Roy Santana (EFA West)		
Ralph Lee (WSF Concord)	<i>Ralph M. Lee</i>	925-246-5061
REGULATORY AGENCIES		
Susan Gladstone (RWQCB)		
Nicole Moutoux (U.S. EPA)	<i>Nicole Moutoux</i>	415 744-2364
James Pinasco (DTSC)	<i>Jim Pinasco</i>	916 288 3719
Lynn Suer (U.S. EPA)		

Date: _____

[illegible]

Date: _____

[illegible]

